



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/855,590	05/16/2001	Shinji Fukasawa	010623	1417
23850	7590	12/09/2004	EXAMINER	
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			QUACH, TUAN N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2814	

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/855,590	FUKASAWA, SHINJI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tuan Quach	2814	

All Participants:

(1) Tuan Quach.

(2) William L. Brooks Reg. No. 34,129.

Status of Application: Non Final Rejection

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 7 December 2004

Time: 10:00 AM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

See part II

Claims discussed:

See part II

Prior art documents discussed:

See part II

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

T. Quach
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's attorney Brooks asserts that the issue of "metal wiring area" as the pertinent feature not taught by the prior art and that an amendment will be filed. The examiner indicates that this assertion together with any amendment would require further study, including arguments regarding patentability with regard to the applied prior art as well as the issue of intended use. The examiner further encourages the submission of specific arguments pointing out particularly pertinent support in the specification, relevant portions of the figures, particular claim language, supporting applicant's assertion of patentability over the applied prior art.